

**CHARTER COMMISSION
COMMITTEE ON SUBMISSION AND INFORMATION
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU**

**FRIDAY, AUGUST 25, 2006
CITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE ROOM
SECOND FLOOR, HONOLULU HALE
4:00 P.M.**

MINUTES

Committee Members Present:

Jan Sullivan
Donn Takaki
E. Gordon Grau (Late 4:06 p.m.)
Amy Hirano
Jim Myers

Committee Members Absent

Darolyn Lendio – Excused
Jeffrey Mikulina - Excused

Others Present:

Chuck Narikiyo, Executive Administrator, Charter Commission
Diane Kawauchi, Deputy Corporation Counsel, Department of the Corporation Counsel
Loretta Ho, Secretary, Charter Commission
Nicole Love, Researcher, Charter Commission

1. Call to Order

Committee Chair Jan Sullivan called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. on August 25, 2006. Chair Sullivan explained the purpose of the meeting and went over housekeeping rules and stated that testimony will be limited to three minutes and must be related to the agenda.

2. For Approval - Minutes

ACTION: Commissioner Hirano moved to approve the minutes of July 20, 2006. Commissioner Myers seconded that motion. Executive Administrator Narikiyo noted before they finalize the minutes, staff would make clerical and grammatical changes as they see fit.

All Committee members present voted in favor of the approval of the minutes of July 20, 2006, and the minutes were approved.

3. Executive Administrator's Report

Executive Administrator Narikiyo stated today the Committee would discuss and come up with recommendations for review and approval by the full Commission meeting on Monday, August 28, 2006. On the agenda are review and discussion and possible revision to the public education plan; review of bids and selection for printing, mailing services and media

services; and review of language and format for the digest, notice and brochure. He went on to say copies of the bids they have received have been distributed and the staff drafted language for the digest and the brochure for them to review and discuss as a starting point today. He noted Corporation Counsel has also made some recommendations, which have been distributed. He stated it's important that they get all of these done for the Commission meeting on Monday because they are coming up against some deadlines.

Executive Administrator Narikiyo gave a brief update on publicity related activities. He commented they have continued updates on the website, issuing press releases periodically, they have been requested to give presentations at the Ala Moana Lion's Club and a committee at the Japanese Chamber of Commerce. He noted they have been contacted by a few Neighborhood Boards to give presentations or to provide them with information and also OMPO asked for them to do a presentation in October. Executive Administrator Narikiyo stated he has also spoke to reporters from AARP and Honolulu Weekly and they are both planning articles about the Charter amendments.

4. Public Information Program

- **Digest/Notice for publication in September (language, format)**
- **Brochure (language, format)**
- **Full text and translations**
- **Speaking engagements (scheduling, content/format of presentations)**
- **TV and radio ads**
- **Press releases or other print opportunities**
- **Sample ballot or other newspaper ads**
- **Website**
- **Other ideas**

Review, discussion, possible revision to public information program (**Attachment #1**) – Executive Administrator Narikiyo noted this has already been approved and could be presented to the full Commission on Monday per the Commission's rules. He stated since that time there has been further review and some comments from some of the Commissioners and wanted to put it on the agenda to allow for discussion and revision of the plan if the Committee wishes. He noted Commissioner Hirano had some comments and Commissioner Chang had some comments that he wanted Executive Administrator Narikiyo to pass along. Commissioner Chang's concerns are if the Commissioners make presentations to Committee Groups, Trade Groups or Neighborhood Boards his concern is everyone has their own personal viewpoints and his feeling was maybe that can't help but color the presentation so he wanted to be careful of that. His other concern is the selection of groups to whom they present, he wanted to make sure the Commission is cognizant if the Commission goes out to make presentations to group "A" and not group "B", then group "B" may be unhappy or say something about it. Commissioner Chang suggested that the Commission does purely informational distribution of materials or maybe only give presentation to those that ask. Executive Administrator Narikiyo asked Commissioner Hirano on her thoughts. Commissioner Hirano responded her concern is along the lines of Commissioner Chang regarding the format on how they would present to the various organizations. She commented they need to be careful that they basically give the number of amendments, what the amendments are and invite them to visit the Commission's

website and really study the digest. Commissioner Hirano commented she would hate to be the one to present and be placed on the spot and getting into giving a little too much information or giving a bias one way or the other.

Executive Administrator Narikiyo stated at the full Commission meeting they would discuss that issue further and noted he wasn't sure if anyone wanted to amend the plan. He commented Researcher Nikki Love surveyed the Commission for their availability for Neighborhood Boards or others and received only a couple of responses. Commissioner Myers commented he was under the impression that they were going to have something pre-made for them as far as a presentation that they would adhere to so that all the presentations would be the same. He went on to say he was also under the impression that they would not solicit groups to speak to that they would go forward to ask because they would probably have lots of requests. Executive Administrator Narikiyo responded he does have something he put together when he went to the Lion's Club and would be happy to provide the Commissioners at the full Commission meeting.

Commissioner Takaki stated to address Commissioner Myers' comments; the Commission has not solicited any groups. They have only responded to groups that have asked the Commission to speak if they were able to speak, they have gone and done a presentation. He clarified their presentation has been along the lines of a handout that has been prepared by staff and tried to keep it as an informative discussion piece and stick to the outline. He noted he thinks it would be a good idea to provide the handout to the other Commissioners to show them what basic information he is giving out when he does presentations. Executive Administrator Narikiyo commented he would pass it out on Monday. Commissioner Myers commented his feeling is they are not there to discuss the merits of any individual item because that's not what their purpose would be but their purpose is to get people out to vote.

Chair Sullivan asked the Committee members if anyone wanted to refine Attachment 1, or is it their preference to leave it as is and pass it out to the full Commission. Commissioner Takaki commented his preference is to leave it as is. Commissioner Myers responded it's his preference also.

5. Review of Bids

Chair Sullivan asked Commissioner Myers to summarize the bids or would he like Executive Administrator Narikiyo to do it. Executive Administrator Narikiyo responded he could give the basics first. He stated the Committee passed a motion to staff to solicit and secure bids for printing, media services and mailing services. He went on to say he did so in consultation with Commissioner Myers and with the Council's Administrative Services Officer Clayton Wong who is very well versed in procurement and together came up with three RFP's that were sent out to prospective bidders. EA noted they had sent out RFP's to six printing companies and received four bids; received two bids out of four prospective vendors for mailing services; and received two out of three prospective bids for media consultants. He suggests to Chair Sullivan that they start with the printing proposals and handle them separately.

Chair Sullivan started with printing. Chair Sullivan asked if they are bound legally by

procurement to select the lowest bid? Executive Administrator Narikiyo responded he spoke to Clayton Wong and he also looked at the State Procurement law, which they are bound to follow. He stated the operative language is most advantageous and his understanding is they are not necessarily bound to accept the lowest bid that other factors could come into play but all things being equal, the general practice is to take the lowest bid. Chair Sullivan of the RFP's they received is there a recommendation Executive Administrator Narikiyo is making? Executive Administrator Narikiyo responded he doesn't have a recommendation but the Ryan's Graphics is the lowest and he knows Commissioner Myers has some experience with various companies. Commissioner Myers responded he has experience with all the companies that have bid except for Ryan's Graphics and has asked his production department to do research on them today and if they don't get any response or reading of any kind but thinks Commissioner Takaki has had some experience with them and maybe he could shed some light? Commissioner Takaki responded he was going to abstain from voting on this category because they are a vendor of his company and he was going to ask Corporation Counsel for their opinion. Commissioner Myers noted he would be a vendor of all three of the other vendors that submitted their proposals. Commissioner Takaki stated he's familiar with them because they are a vendor of his company that's why he thought they should ask them to bid. Commissioner Hirano commented she uses Ryan's Graphics and find it's their personal preference because she finds that they turn around projects very quickly for them. Commissioner Myers asked Commissioner Hirano if Ryan's Graphics have ever done a project of this magnitude? Commissioner Hirano responded yes. Commissioner Myers stated they have only accepted vendors that have passed their screening and not that they haven't but they never tried. He went on to say he would be comfortable if both of the other Commissioners who have done business with them feel that they could handle a job of this size, and then he'd be inclined to go with the low bidder. Commissioner Sullivan asked Executive Administrator Narikiyo the note attached to their bid that says, "One month notification of upcoming job", is that an issue. Executive Administrator Narikiyo responded from his understanding it is not a large impediment because they know generally the time frame they are going to need so they could give them a month's notice. He stated as he understands their parameters of their bid is they need to make sure they have the paper on hand and doesn't believe it's a big deal. Chair Sullivan asked when would they be mailed out by? Executive Administrator Narikiyo responded mid October is the projected timeframe. Commissioner Myers commented that would be more for a smaller company because they just don't have the paper in stock, none of the others put that down because they would have the paper or any equipment in stock with no problems at all.

Commissioner Grau asked is the scope they are asking Ryan's Graphics to do in the same size range as Commissioner Hirano or Commissioner Takaki has done in the past? Commissioner Takaki responded for his business they have not asked Ryan's Graphics to do such large production runs, but they have asked them to do many different things and that's always worked out fine for them. Commissioner Hirano responded Ryan's Graphics has been their client based and they've done huge projects, they've done great big print stocks, magazines, brochures and she's surprised that their pricing is good because normally they are expensive.

ACTION:

Commissioner Myers moved to accept the bid from Ryan's Graphics. Commissioner Grau

seconded that motion. Discussion followed.

Commissioner Takaki asked Corporation Counsel because they do business with Ryan's Graphics is he excluded from voting or does it not make a difference? Deputy Corporation Counsel Kawauchi responded she would asked that those that did represent that on the record which they both did. She went on to say the fact they are looking at the lowest bid, which is preference of what the procurement code is, where she has less of a concern at this instance if he votes.

AYES: SULLIVAN, GRAU, HIRANO, MYERS - 4
ABSTAIN: TAKAKI - 1
NOES: NONE
EXCUSED: LENDIO, MIKULINA – 2

Motion passed.

Chair Sullivan moved on to the media consultants. Executive Administrator Narikiyo stated the media consultant was a little trickier and what they ended up doing was asking for bids for the media consultant services only. He went on to say part of the media consultant's job is going to be to coordinate and recommend third party vendors for such things as production, placement of Television ads, radio ads, translation services for the digest and full text of the amendments. Executive Administrator Narikiyo stated they received two bids, both were flat fees, one was for \$7,800 and the other for \$14,583. He commented he discussed the two bids with Commissioner Myers earlier in the day and their feeling is go with Medialogy Consulting which is the lower bid contingent on them meeting with them soon and confirming that their bid includes all the services the Charter Commission needs. Commissioner Myers responded that's basically the conversation they had. Commissioner Myers expressed concerns that the bids are so far apart that something was missed and because doesn't want to find out during the campaign that their bid didn't include that and just wants to make sure because he doesn't know the person, never done business with them and has a concern that they got the scope of what they were doing. Executive Administrator Narikiyo commented he thinks that would be fine.

Chair Sullivan asked Executive Administrator Narikiyo to clarify what is the bid supposed to cover? Executive Administrator Narikiyo responded it is supposed to cover their consulting services. Commissioner Myers clarified it does not cover the price of the media they would be purchasing but it covers their services to negotiate schedules to get time placements and so on. He went on to say in the media sometimes it's difficult because some media buyers carry more weight than other media buyers, some media buyers could get better schedules than other media buyers and so on. Chair Sullivan stated when she read the "Intermedia" quote it seems to be saying its \$14,000 for media buying and planning. Commissioner Myers responded its media buying services and not the media. Executive Administrator Narikiyo clarified they do have a much larger budget for the actual media. Commissioner Hirano added basically what the media consultant does they would do the plan for them, they would do the targeting, they'll do all the demos and how best to reach audiences and through that they set up the media buys for them but it's basically a plan. Commissioner Myers commented they negotiate with the media companies for them. Chair Sullivan commented that helps clarify her question.

Commissioner Grau asked what if Medialogy is not covering all the same things or is unable to deliver the same service, what do they do then? Commissioner Myers responded if they could get this done in time, he would like to rebid because he's not sure if he would just go with the \$14,000 bid either because he thinks that's a little high. He noted in work that he has done, he didn't expect bids to come in at over \$10,000. Commissioner Grau commented Medialogy's bid might be perfectly appropriate. Commissioner Myers responded it might be, he just wants to be sure because he's doesn't know this person and has called several people in the media who also doesn't know this person. He went on to say that everyone knows the other person all of the TV Stations and they all would say yes, they know Intermedia. He stated what they are asking for is a little more time to make sure this person could handle the job. Chair Sullivan asked should they call for a motion that's conditional? Commissioner Myers responded contingent. Executive Administrator Narikiyo added that would be preferable from staff prospective because one of the media consultant's job is to coordinate the translations and those have to be done right away.

Commissioner Grau asked what is the contingency, to re-bid? Commissioner Myers responded he thinks the contingency is that they are able to check and make sure that Medialogy Consulting can actually handle the job and if they can, there would be no need to re-bid but if they can't then rather than just go to the other bidder, he thinks they would re-bid again. Commissioner Myers asked Corporation Counsel if they eliminate one of the bidders because they think they can't handle the job do they have to state it in their motion? Executive Administrator Narikiyo responded he doesn't believe that would be necessary. Commissioner Myers commented to make it contingent on the fact after they meet they believe they can't handle the job. Executive Administrator Narikiyo added they did send the bids out to three prospective vendors and received two bids and the procurement law basically says that they need to go with the bid that is most advantageous and obviously if one of the bidders didn't meet the requirements, he thinks that would be taken care of by this law. Commissioner Myers commented truthfully Intermedia may have two or three political clients who are going to be in the mix at the same time and they are saying they need to get paid highly more because they'll be busy and doesn't know the criteria they set-forth. He noted Medialogy may not have anything going on and could put in a low bid and that could be what had happened because he knows Intermedia is extremely busy and may have purposely bid high.

Commissioner Takaki asked Corporation Counsel if they should make a motion for a contingent acceptance? Or should they delegate it to Commissioner Myers? Deputy Corporation Counsel Kawauchi responded she's concerned what the Committee is asking in the event following consultation with Medialogy and determine that it's bid does not include all the activities that the Committee contemplated. She stated would then prefers the Executive Administrator Narikiyo have the authority to reject the remaining bid and re-bid. Commissioner Myers responded that's what he would like to do because if the person didn't include everything that they wanted, he feels they should have the right to re-bid to include everything. Executive Administrator Narikiyo commented he thinks the vote should be clearly stated.

Commissioner Grau stated for point of information, if the re-bid comes back and Medialogy bids closely to Intermedia what happens then? Executive Administrator Narikiyo responded if it's permissible maybe it probably should be delegated to staff but maybe to Commissioner Myers to go with the lower bid after 30 days or something like that. Commissioner Grau

stated his concern is he knows nothing about Mediaology is that maybe there's a reason why politicians hired Intermedia to do their job. Commissioner Myers responded like he said before some media buyers have more clout. In the case of politicians the rates are pretty much prescribed by law, they get the lowest available on the station period and their commercials for the most part are not pre-emptable so they don't really need a high quality media person to get them the best rate. They need someone who would get their stuff in fairly on time and proper. Commissioner Myers clarified in the Charter Commission's case they are not considered political and would not be getting the lowest rates and would have to fight for what they get and the placements they get. He stated their job will be much more difficult to get on the air and good times.

ACTION:

Commissioner Grau moved that they empower staff and Commissioner Myers to investigate whether Mediaology is capable of doing the job, whether they have bid all the services Intermedia has bid, and to make a determination if they find that Mediaology is acceptable to empower them to engage them or if they find that either the bid is not inclusive then they have the discretionary power to re-bid the project. Commissioner Takaki seconded that motion. Deputy Corporation Counsel Kawauchi recommended to say re-bid an award. Commissioner Grau agrees. Chair Sullivan asked Corporation Counsel to restate the motion. Executive Administrator Narikiyo restated the motion. No further discussion.

AYES: SULLIVAN, GRAU, HIRANO, MYERS, TAKAKI - 5
NOES: NONE
EXCUSED: LENDIO, MIKULINA – 2

Motion passed.

Mailing Services. Executive Administrator Narikiyo stated they sent out RFP's to four vendors and have received two bids and they are very close in price. Cardinal Services, Ltd. price quote was \$7,591.10 and Hagadone Printing Company's price is \$7,470.79. Chair Sullivan asked if he had any recommendations. Executive Administrator Narikiyo responded this one's prices are very close and doesn't know one way or the other if Commissioner's have experience with but the lowest bid would be Hagadone Printing Company. Commissioner Grau asked the Committee members if any of them had experience? Commissioner Hirano commented she's used them both. Commissioner Myers commented he has used both and has had better service with Cardinal. Commissioner Hirano agrees.

Commissioner Grau asked Corporation Counsel with their recommendation does a \$100 stand in the way of choosing the vendor? Deputy Corporation Counsel Kawauchi responded she believes the concern would be whether the Committee could determine that someone other than the low bid would better provide the service.

Chair Sullivan commented her preference would be to go with the low bid because she feels mailing is straightforward.

ACTION:

Commissioner Takaki moved to accept lower bid from Hagadone. Commissioner Hirano seconded that motion. No discussion followed.

AYES: SULLIVAN, GRAU, HIRANO, MYERS, TAKAKI - 5
NOES: NONE
EXCUSED: LENDIO, MIKULINA – 2

Motion passed.

6. Language and Format of Digests/Brochure

Chair Sullivan asked Corporation Counsel to go their revisions that were handed out today. Executive Administrator Narikiyo explained the agenda's Attachment 2 is the staff suggested version and there is also a Corporation Counsel version, and he asked the Committee members to use that version for their discussion because it has the staff's version with red lines where the Corporation Counsel made changes. Chair Sullivan asked Corporation Counsel to explain what was changed and why. Deputy Corporation Counsel Kawauchi went over the handout. (***Attachment 2 – Corporation Counsel version***).

PROPOSAL 1 – Salary Commission – NO CHANGES BY CORPORATION COUNSEL

ACTION:

First Motion:

Commissioner Myers moved to approve Version 1. Commissioner Takaki seconded that motion. Discussion followed.

Chair Sullivan asked Commissioner Myers to explain why he prefers the first version. Commissioner Myers responded he thinks it states it clearer and he had a preference for each question on which he thought would feel better if he was reading it on the ballot or the digest.

Chair Sullivan commented she doesn't have strong feelings on this but some of them liked the first part of one and the second part of another. Commissioner Myers agreed.

Second Motion:

Commissioner Takaki asked if it would be okay to amend the motion to accept Version 2 "If the proposal passes". Chair Sullivan asked for clarification. Commissioner Takaki asked if he could make a motion to accept "Version 1 Present" and "Version 2 If the proposal passes"? It seems that is what Commissioner Grau and Chair Sullivan prefer. Commissioner Myers responded he would accept that as a friendly amendment.

Chair Sullivan asked for a second on the motion to amend. Commissioner Hirano seconded that motion.

AYES: SULLIVAN, GRAU, HIRANO, MYERS, TAKAKI - 5
NOES: NONE
EXCUSED: LENDIO, MIKULINA – 2

Second Motion passed.

First Motion:

AYES: SULLIVAN, GRAU, HIRANO, MYERS, TAKAKI - 5
NOES: NONE
EXCUSED: LENDIO, MIKULINA – 2

First Motion (to approve as amended) passed.

PROPOSAL 5 – Elections

Chair Sullivan asked Corporation Counsel for their comments. Deputy Corporation Counsel Kawauchi commented she understood Version 1 was seeking to not identify first special election as the Primary Election. But because Version 1 uses those terms it was a concern for Corporation Counsel because the City's Elections are not Primary Elections or General Elections because they are non-partisan elections and wanted to use the terminology, First Special Election and Second Special Election and to try not to confuse the reader to use Primary Election and General Election in parentheses. Chair Sullivan asked if it would be incorrect to leave as it has been proposed with Primary and General Election? She asked if was technically a problem or a matter of trying to make it clearer? Deputy Corporation Counsel Kawauchi responded she thinks the language originally could be read to mean at a Primary Election, it's a nuance and doesn't know if the reader would necessarily pick up on. Deputy Corporation Counsel Kawauchi stated the language originally says in the present description for the version 1, "are held during the Primary Elections". She went on to say she feels that it could be read to mean it's the primary election rather than just an election held on the day of the Primary Election.

Chair Sullivan noted there's a further amendment on the second version and asked Corporation Counsel to explain. Deputy Corporation Counsel Kawauchi responded the first is for clarification; and election contest and then again it's not "decided in the General Election", "it's decided on the day of the General Election" because it's a second special election that is going to make that determination.

ACTION:

Commissioner Myers moved to accept Version 1 as changed by Corporation Counsel. Commissioner Takaki seconded that motion. Discussion followed.

Commissioner Myers commented he doesn't think the general public knows what a special election is and they view it as primary and general but in order to be clear for those who do, this would work.

AYES: SULLIVAN, GRAU, HIRANO, MYERS, TAKAKI - 5
NOES: NONE
EXCUSED: LENDIO, MIKULINA – 2

Motion passed.

PROPOSAL 27 – Liquor Administrator

Deputy Corporation Counsel Kawauchi commented the charter amendment that has been approved by the Commission for this proposal creates a new exempt secretary position, and what they tried to do with their revision was to clarify while there are currently civil service positions for the Liquor Administrator and the Deputy Liquor Administrator, they are not seeking to change the secretary civil service position to an exempt position but this would be a new position entirely.

ACTION:

Commissioner Myers moved to accept Version 1 as changed by Corporation Counsel. Commissioner Hirano seconded that motion. No discussion followed.

AYES: SULLIVAN, GRAU, HIRANO, MYERS, TAKAKI - 5
NOES: NONE
EXCUSED: LENDIO, MIKULINA – 2

Motion passed.

PROPOSAL 28 – Ethics Commission fines

Deputy Corporation Counsel Kawauchi commented in both versions if the proposal passes they wanted to insert that the "fine that would be established by ordinance" would be "the amount of the fines" which was done in version one and two. She stated in version two, if the proposal passes the language they revised in first bullet point is for style.

Executive Administrator Narikiyo noted written testimony was received by the Ethics Commission and has been distributed.

ACTION:

Commissioner Myers moved to accept Version 1 as changed by Corporation Counsel. Commissioner Hirano seconded that motion. No discussion followed.

AYES: SULLIVAN, GRAU, HIRANO, MYERS, TAKAKI - 5
NOES: NONE
EXCUSED: LENDIO, MIKULINA – 2

Motion passed.

PROPOSALS 33 AND 36 – Emergency Services and Fire

Executive Administrator Narikiyo noted written testimony from EMS and was been received for this proposal and has been distributed.

Deputy Corporation Counsel Kawauchi advised the Committee that they have been in contact with Deputy Chief Alvin Tomita of the Fire Department and he indicated that both versions were fine although their preference would be for version 1.

Deputy Corporation Counsel Kawauchi commented in version 1 the “present” language, they wanted to clarify that the proposal is to conform the charter to the duties already being performed and didn’t want the reader to be lead to believe that the charter language was somehow changing the activities of the department. She stated if the proposal passes in version 1 the language that was deleted was taken out because that was not part of the charter proposal and that language already existing in the charter so the charter isn’t being amended to put that in. Chair Sullivan asked if that should be in version 2 as well? Deputy Corporation Counsel Kawauchi responded yes, they missed that. Commissioner Myers asked Deputy Corporation Counsel Kawauchi for clarification, if it’s their feeling they need to tell people that they are being performed, should they say “that are already being performed” which would make it much clearer if it is the intent. Deputy Corporation Counsel Kawauchi responded in the affirmative.

ACTION:

Commissioner Grau moved to approve Version 1 be accepted with the amendment of the word “already” be inserted before the word being in the “Present” language fourth line and with the Corporation Counsel changes. Commissioner Myers seconded that motion. No discussion followed.

AYES: SULLIVAN, GRAU, HIRANO, MYERS, TAKAKI - 5
NOES: NONE
EXCUSED: LENDIO, MIKULINA – 2

Motion passed.

PROPOSAL 34 – Capital budget funds

Chair Sullivan noted there were no changes proposed by Corporation Counsel.

ACTION:

Commissioner Myers moved to accept Version 2. Commissioner Takaki seconded that motion. Discussion followed.

Commissioner Takaki asked Commissioner Myers why he chose Version 2. Commissioner Myers responded he felt it stated it better.

AYES: SULLIVAN, GRAU, HIRANO, MYERS, TAKAKI - 5
NOES: NONE
EXCUSED: LENDIO, MIKULINA – 2

Motion passed.

PROPOSAL 55 – Staggering and Term Limits

Deputy Corporation Counsel Kawauchi commented when they reviewed the first Honolulu Charter, Charter Commission 1972 one of their guiding principles was to structure a form of charter that provided for a strong Mayor and a strong Council. She stated that's been a guiding principle for their office when they try to construe the language of the existing charter to know that the Charter Commission had intended there be a balance between these two branches of the city government. She went on to say she felt it was important that in the digest which is really dealing with the City Council term limits and the City Council staggering of terms that when talking about extending the City Council terms or eliminating term limits that it will somehow impact the balance of power between the Council and the Mayor. If there are then no term limits for the Councilmember but the Mayor continues to be limited to a two-year term or if the Council term limits are extended to three consecutive terms and the Mayor remains at two consecutive terms term limits. She stated that was one of their revisions made throughout all the versions - question one and two and "if the proposal passes." She goes on to say their second revision she made, in version two, question one present, the language says; "half of the seats are elected in one election and the other half is elected in the other". She stated that's technically not true because there are nine seats and she clarified that there are five seats in one election and four seats in the other election.

Chair Sullivan asked Deputy Corporation Counsel Kawauchi if it was necessary to put the second sentence in version one present? Chair Sullivan also asked if it was in the second version? Executive Administrator Narikiyo responded it was not in the second version. Executive Administrator Narikiyo clarified he drafted version one and the reason he put in that particular sentence was because it was in the 1992 brochure so he added it in. Chair Sullivan clarified that doesn't change anything. Executive Administrator Narikiyo responded no it doesn't change anything.

ACTION:

Commissioner Myers moved to accept version 2 as changed by Corporation Counsel.

Commissioner Grau seconded that motion. Discussion followed.

Commissioner Myers stated he choose version two because he found all the numbers and the years confusing and boring to read and felt they didn't need to be that specific and felt version two says what it is and what they would be changing. Commissioner Takaki asked Commissioner Myers if he also preferred the Corporation Counsel's addition to the language of addressing they Mayor's term limits specifically in this question as well? Commissioner Myers responded he thinks it's probably good information for the public to know that the Mayor's is not being changed because someone may question that and also that it should be brought up there for anyone who may be concerned with now they are possibly giving Councilmembers either no term limits or an extra term limit over and above the Mayor.

AYES: SULLIVAN, GRAU, HIRANO, MYERS, TAKAKI - 5
NOES: NONE
EXCUSED: LENDIO, MIKULINA – 2

Motion passed.

PROPOSAL 71 – Curbside recycling

Deputy Corporation Counsel Kawauchi explained they added a comma after the word systems in Version 1 "Present" second sentence.

ACTION:

Commissioner Myers moved to accept "Present" in version 1 as changed by Corporation Counsel and "If Proposal Passes" in version 2. Commissioner Grau seconded that motion. No discussion followed.

AYES: SULLIVAN, GRAU, HIRANO, MYERS, TAKAKI - 5
NOES: NONE
EXCUSED: LENDIO, MIKULINA – 2

Motion passed.

PROPOSAL 91 – Funds for conservation and affordable housing

Deputy Corporation Counsel Kawauchi explained their change is in respect to the "Present" situation in version 2. It is to clarify when the original language says that there was "no similar provisions in the charter", they wanted to expand on that to indicate that it is the designation of monies to a specific funds that does not currently exist in the charter.

ACTION:

Commissioner Myers moved to accept version 1. Commissioner Grau seconded that motion. No discussion followed.

AYES: SULLIVAN, GRAU, HIRANO, MYERS, TAKAKI - 5
NOES: NONE
EXCUSED: LENDIO, MIKULINA – 2

Motion passed.

PROPOSAL S-9

Deputy Corporation Counsel Kawauchi explained they wanted to refer to bikeway systems and in version 1 “Present” description they changed the language with new language they felt might be clearer. Deputy Corporation Counsel Kawauchi commented that if she may remind the Chair that she should be soliciting public comments. Executive Administrator Narikiyo responded he had advised her maybe erroneously that since they had the digest language as one agenda item, she did ask for testimony earlier.

Mr. Kevin Killian asked to testify.

The following individuals testified:

1. Kevin Killian

Kevin Killian testified that he would prefer version 2 because it’s simpler.

ACTION:

Commissioner Hirano moved to adopt version 2 with Corporation Counsel’s revisions. Commissioner Myers seconded that motion. No discussion followed.

AYES: SULLIVAN, GRAU, HIRANO, MYERS, TAKAKI - 5
NOES: NONE
EXCUSED: LENDIO, MIKULINA – 2

Motion passed.

HOUSEKEEPING

Deputy Corporation Counsel Kawauchi stated they wanted to conform to the language agreed upon by the Style Committee for this ballot question and wanted to identify what kinds of items were before the voters in this one ballot question and tried to break it out. Commissioner Hirano commented it was good and reads better.

Commissioner Takaki asked Corporation Counsel if this was similar to when the Committee on Style met, she said they had to call out the electronic medium. Deputy Corporation Counsel Kawauchi responded yes, they wouldn’t lump it as a housekeeping item and thinks the Committee’s understanding at that time was that housekeeping was something that was

mandated because of law changes or maybe more in the non-substantive nature as a clarification language change. Whereas the electronic notice she doesn't know typically if it would fit into that kind of a category. Commissioner Myers commented he agrees. He stated for this they only need to accept the changes from Corporation Counsel to move it forward.

Chair Sullivan asked Corporation Counsel if it was advisable to use the term "as internet" with the idea they are trying to adopt language that will apply for the next 50 or so years? Deputy Corporation Counsel Kawauchi responded she would prefer that not be included but it was originally in the draft language and she just reiterated. Chair Sullivan stated her concern would be if they made it broader it's more likely to be applicable longer. Executive Administrator Narikiyo asked if she was referring to last sentence. Chair Sullivan responded she was referring to the last parenthesis. Deputy Corporation Counsel Kawauchi responded paragraph g. Executive Administrator Narikiyo stated this was in the text of the final proposed language. Chair Sullivan responded she knows and realized that.

ACTION:

Commissioner Takaki moved to accept the revisions by Corporation Counsel and by deleting the last part of paragraph g, "(such as the internet)". He asked Chair Sullivan for clarification if that is what she was asking. Chair Sullivan responded that would be her preference. Deputy Corporation Counsel Kawauchi commented the Executive Administrator Narikiyo's point was that's the language that is going to appear in the charter. Chair Sullivan commented they haven't voted on it yet, right? Executive Administrator Narikiyo responded that it is subject to the full Commission's vote.

Commissioner Grau commented if they do that could they add the word "an" after the word "via" in paragraph g? Commissioner Takaki commented he could take that as a friendly amendment if there is second. Commissioner Myers seconded that motion. Commissioner Takaki stated he takes that as a friendly amendment.

AYES: SULLIVAN, GRAU, HIRANO, MYERS, TAKAKI - 5
NOES: NONE
EXCUSED: LENDIO, MIKULINA - 2

Motion passed.

Commissioner Myers asked what if it stays in the language, would they have the opportunity to put this back in. Executive Administrator Narikiyo responded he believes they would because it's subject to the full Commission vote so they could do this at that time. He clarified this is digest language so it doesn't necessarily doesn't have to track everything in the proposal itself.

******Commissioner Hirano left meeting – 5:13 p.m.******

DRAFT INTRODUCTORY TEXT

Executive Administrator Narikiyo stated there are three versions of introductory text and if the Committee has a preference and want to express one, the staff would have more guidance. He commented Researcher Nikki Love did three different approaches of the introductory language that will be included with the digest of the various proposed amendments.

Commissioner Myers asked Executive Administrator Narikiyo since this was part of their agenda, don't they have to take some type of action? Executive Administrator Narikiyo responded he doesn't think it's necessary but if they didn't put in on the agenda, they wouldn't be able to take any action. Commissioner Myers asked should they at least say they would let staff or someone else decide. Executive Administrator Narikiyo responded he would prefer that. Commissioner Myers asked if Executive Administrator Narikiyo was asking for comments? Executive Administrator Narikiyo responded yes, if they had any comments. Commissioner Myers commented he likes version two. Executive Administrator Narikiyo stated he would be very happy if the Committee made a motion to go with one of the three versions. Chair Sullivan commented she agrees with Commissioner Myers on selecting version two.

ACTION:

Commissioner Myers moved to accept version 2 with revisions by Corporation Counsel. Commissioner Takaki seconded that motion. Discussion followed.

Commissioner Grau asked if there was any utility to retaining the word "constitution" at some point? Chair Sullivan asked Corporation Counsel the purpose of deleting the word "constitution". Deputy Corporation Counsel Kawauchi responded it was a style preference and she acknowledged that maybe the public has a better sense of what a "constitution" is rather than a charter and they prefer the terminology "governing document."

Commissioner Grau suggest revising it to say, "The City Charter is Honolulu's constitution serving as the governing document." Executive Administrator Narikiyo clarified constitution in quotes? Commissioner Grau responded yes constitution in quotes. Chair Sullivan reread Commissioner Grau suggested change, "The City and County of Honolulu's constitution. Commissioner Grau clarified constitution, and the word constitution is in quotes. Commissioner Myers stated because the City does not have a constitution so they can't call it that. Commissioner Myers asked Corporation Counsel what do they think about Commissioner Grau's suggested revision because he'll take it as a friendly amendment? Deputy Corporation Counsel Kawauchi that's fine with the changes.

Chair Sullivan restated the motion which has been amended to add the words "constitution," serving as the".

AYES:	SULLIVAN, GRAU, MYERS, TAKAKI - 4
NOES:	NONE
EXCUSED:	HIRANO, LENDIO, MIKULINA - 3

Motion passed.

7. Announcements

Executive Administrator Narikiyo commented based on the Committee's decisions today they would distribute at Monday's meeting everything in final form for the full Commission's consideration.

8. Next Meeting

Executive Administrator Narikiyo commented they may want to meet in September to go over the mock-ups but will determine that later.

9. Adjournment

Commissioner Grau moved to adjourn. Commissioner Myers seconded that motion.

Meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

ATTACHMENT #1

SUBMISSION & INFORMATION COMMITTEE 8/25/06

PUBLIC EDUCATION PLAN

Approved by Submission & Information Committee on 7/20/06

SEPTEMBER

(Sept 1 – Final ballot language to City Clerk)

(Sept 23 – Primary Election)

- Prepare brochure and newspaper advertisements
- Prepare radio/TV advertisements
- Schedule presentations to organizations, talk shows
- Press releases
- Public service announcements
- Updated website
- By Sept 23 - Publish digest/notice in both major daily newspapers (required by Charter)
- By Sept 23 - Publish digest/notice in Chinese, Japanese, Ilocano newspapers

OCTOBER

(Early October – Clerk mails absentee ballots)

(Oct 24-Nov 4 – Walk-in absentee voting)

- Presentations to Neighborhood boards, organization meetings
- Appearances on talk shows (radio, TV)
- Sample ballot?
- Press releases
- Public service announcements
- Website
- Mid-October - Bulk mailing of brochure to all voting households
- Mid-October - TV, radio, newspaper ads

NOVEMBER

(Nov 7 – General Election)

ATTACHMENT #2

SUBMISSION & INFORMATION COMMITTEE 8/25/06

DRAFT DIGEST LANGUAGE

PROPOSAL 1 – Salary Commission

VERSION 1

Present: The City Council has the power to reject the Salary Commission's recommendations as to the salaries of elected officials and certain high-ranking City employees.

If proposal passes:

- The City Council would no longer have the power to reject the Salary Commission's recommendations.
- The Salary Commission's recommendations would take effect automatically.

VERSION 2

Present: The Salary Commission establishes salaries for all City elected officials and various appointed officials. The Salary Commission's decisions on salaries may be rejected by a three-quarters vote of the City Council.

If proposal passes:

- The Salary Commission's decisions on salaries and salary schedules would be final.
- The City Council would not be able to reject the Salary Commission's decisions.

PROPOSAL 5 - Elections

VERSION 1

Present: All City elections, even those involving two candidates only, are held during the first special election (on Primary Election day).

If proposal passes:

- In any City Election in which there are only two candidates for a position, the election would be held at the second special election (on General Election day), rather than at the first special election (on Primary Election day).

VERSION 2

Present: When there are only two candidates for any city elective office, those candidates appear on the ballot for the first special election (Primary Election in September). The candidate who receives a majority of the votes is deemed elected, and therefore the election is decided at the Primary Election.

If proposal passes:

- When there are only two candidates for any city elective office, those candidates would not appear on the ballot at the first special election, but instead they would be placed on the ballot for the second special election (General Election in November). Therefore, the election contest would be decided at the time of the General Election.

PROPOSAL 27 – Liquor Administrator

VERSION 1

Present: The positions of Liquor Administrator and Deputy Liquor Administrator are civil service positions.

If proposal passes:

- The Liquor Administrator, Deputy Liquor Administrator and a new secretary position would be exempt from civil service provisions.
- The Liquor Commission would have the power to appoint and remove the Liquor Administrator.
- The Liquor Administrator would have the power to appoint and remove the Deputy Liquor Administrator and a secretary in a new exempt position.

VERSION 2

Present: The Liquor Commission is responsible for enforcing liquor laws in the City & County of Honolulu. The Liquor Commission staff is headed by the Liquor Administrator and Deputy Administrator. The Liquor Administrator and Deputy Administrator are civil service positions.

If proposal passes:

- The Liquor Administrator, Deputy Liquor Administrator, and a secretary would be exempt from civil service provisions.
- The Liquor Administrator would be appointed and may be removed by the Liquor Commission.
- The Deputy Liquor Administrator and secretary in a new exempt position may ~~would~~ be appointed and may be removed by the Liquor Administrator.

PROPOSAL 28 – Ethics Commission fines

VERSION 1

Present: The Ethics Commission can make recommendations for disciplinary action against elected officers, but cannot impose fines or other discipline.

If proposal passes:

- Ethics Commission would have the power to impose civil monetary fines against elected officers of the City.
- The amount of the fines~~Fines~~ would be established by ordinance.

VERSION 2

Present: The Ethics Commission holds hearings, conducts investigations, renders advisory opinions, and recommends disciplinary action for violations of ethics laws by City officers and employees. The Ethics Commission does not have the authority to impose fines for ethics violations.

If proposal passes:

- The Ethics Commission would have the authority to impose fines for ethics violations by ~~on~~-elected City officers ~~for ethics violations~~.
- The amount of the fines would be determined by ordinance.

PROPOSALS 33 AND 36 – Emergency Services and Fire

VERSION 1

Present: The powers, duties, and functions of the director of emergency services and the fire chief are set forth in the Charter, but do not specify certain powers, duties, and functions relating to emergency medical services, ocean safety, hazardous materials, and injury prevention that are being performed by the departments.

If proposal passes:

- The powers, duties, and functions of the director of emergency services would specify that the director shall be the primary provider of emergency medical care, that the director would develop programs related to injury prevention, provide for ocean safety programs, and be the primary responder to emergencies arising on the beach and near shore waters.
- The powers, duties, and functions of the fire chief would specify that the fire chief shall also provide emergency medical care and specify that the fire chief shall respond to ~~emergencies arising on hazardous terrain, on the sea, and~~ hazardous material incidents.

VERSION 2

Present: The director of the Department of Emergency Services is responsible for emergency medical services, training and educational related to emergency services, and ocean safety training and operations in city parks. The Fire Chief is responsible for fire fighting and rescue work, training and supervising fire fighting and rescue personnel, monitoring building standards for fire prevention, and providing fire prevention education.

If proposal passes:

- The charter would reflect the additional functions currently being provided by these departments.
- The additional powers, duties, and functions of the director of the Department of Emergency Services would include serving as the primary provider of emergency care; serving as the primary responder to emergencies on the beach and in near shore waters; and being responsible for medical matters relating to public health and welfare.
- The additional powers, duties, and functions of the Fire Chief would include responding to emergencies on hazardous terrain and on the sea; responding to hazardous material incidents; and providing emergency medical care.

PROPOSAL 34 – Capital budget funds

VERSION 1

Present: Capital budget appropriations shall be considered valid only for the fiscal year for which made and for six months thereafter.

If proposal passes:

- Capital budget appropriations would be considered valid for the fiscal year for which made and for 12 months thereafter.
- There would be an additional six months given before appropriations for capital improvements would lapse.

VERSION 2

Present: The capital budget includes appropriations for constructing public improvements, acquiring land, and carrying out planning and engineering studies. Appropriations authorized in the capital budget may be spent during that fiscal year and for 6 months thereafter.

If proposal passes:

- The time would be extended, so that money appropriated in the capital budget may be spent during the fiscal year and for 12 months thereafter.

PROPOSAL 55 – Staggering and Term Limits

VERSION 1

Present: City Council members and the Mayor are limited to two consecutive four-year terms. A Council member may serve more than two terms if the member “sits out” a term. Council terms are currently “staggered” – for example, five of the nine Council seats were up for election in 2004 and again in 2008, and four were up for election in 2002 and again in 2006. Council districts are scheduled for reapportionment every ten years, next in 2011. After reapportionment, council districts will change, which could leave some voters represented by a Council member they did not elect.

If proposal passes:

- The current system of staggered terms and term limits for the Council would be replaced by the alternative that receives the most votes, either (A) no staggering and no term limits; or (B) no staggering and a three term, rather than the current two term limit.
- The term limit for the Mayor would not be changed.

VERSION 2

QUESTION 1

Present: The City Council consists of nine members who are elected to four-year terms. Councilmembers and the Mayor are currently limited to two consecutive four-year terms. Councilmembers’ terms are also staggered, so that fivehalf of the seats are elected in one election, and the other four seatshalf are elected in the next election two years later.

If proposal passes:

- The current system of term limits and staggered termsstaggering for the Council would be changed.
- The new system for the Council would be determined by the result of the vote on the next question.
- The term limit for the Mayor would not be changed.

QUESTION 2

NOTE: Whether you voted “yes” or “no” on the previous question, you may still cast a vote on this question. If the previous question passes, then the new system will be determined by the result of the vote on this question. If the previous question does NOT pass, then the result of the vote on this question will not take effect.

Present: City Council members and the Mayor are currently limited to two consecutive four-year terms. Councilmembers’ terms are staggered, so that fivehalf of the seats are elected in one election, and the other four seatshalf are elected in the next election two years later.

If ALTERNATIVE A is selected:

- Staggering of Councilmember terms would be eliminated, so that all seats would be up for election in the same year.

- Council term~~Term~~ limits would be eliminated; Councilmembers may be re-elected without limit on number of terms served.
- The term limit for the Mayor would not be changed.

If ALTERNATIVE B is selected:

- Staggering of Councilmember terms would be eliminated, so that all seats would be up for election in the same year.
- Council term~~Term~~ limits would be extended, so that Councilmembers may serve up to three consecutive four-year terms.
- Councilmember terms ~~Terms~~ already served would not count toward the limit, so current incumbents would be eligible for an additional three consecutive four-year terms.
- The term limit for the Mayor would not be changed.

PROPOSAL 71 – Curbside recycling

VERSION 1

Present: The powers, duties, and functions of the director of environmental services include the development and administration of solid waste collection, processing, and disposal systems, but do not specifically include curbside recycling.

If proposal passes:

- Development and administration of a comprehensive curbside recycling system would become part of the director of environmental services' powers, duties and functions in the City Charter.

VERSION 2

Present: The director of the Department of Environmental Services is responsible for wastewater facilities, sewer lines, solid waste, and other duties.

If proposal passes:

- The powers, duties, and functions of the director of the Department of Environmental Services would also include developing and administering a comprehensive curbside recycling system.

PROPOSAL 91 – Funds for conservation and affordable housing

VERSION 1

Present: There are no specially dedicated funds for acquisition of public lands for land conservation or for providing and maintaining affordable housing.

If proposal passes:

- A minimum of one percent of real property tax revenues would be placed in two special funds; one fund would be known as the “Clean Water and Natural Lands Fund” and the other would be known as the “Affordable Housing Fund.”
- Moneys in the “Clean Water and Natural Lands Fund” would be used to purchase or acquire real estate for land conservation.
- Moneys in the “Affordable Housing Fund” would be used to provide and maintain affordable housing for persons earning less than fifty percent of the median household income in the city.
- Moneys in the funds would not lapse, but shall remain in the funds, accumulating from year to year.

VERSION 2

Present: The charter does not currently mandate the designation of monies to specific funds~~Currently there are no similar provisions in the charter.~~

If proposal passes:

- In each fiscal year’s budget, the City Council would set aside 1% of estimated real property taxes, half of which will be put into a Clean Water and Natural Lands Fund, and the other half into an Affordable Housing Fund.
- The Clean Water and Natural Lands Fund would be used to purchase or acquire real estate for land conservation
- The Affordable Housing Fund would be used to provide and maintain affordable housing for people earning less than 50% of median household income.
- Any balance in the funds would not lapse, but remain in the funds, accumulating from year to year.

PROPOSAL S-9

VERSION 1

Present: The ~~definition of the~~ powers, duties, and functions of the director of transportation services do not specifically include ~~reference to bikeway~~s systems and do not identify bikeway systems as a department priority~~specifically set forth this as one of the priorities.~~

If proposal passes:

- The powers, duties, and functions of the director of transportation services as set forth in the charter would specifically include ~~reference to “bikeway_”~~systems.
- A new section would be added to the charter setting forth that it shall be one of the priorities of the director of transportation services to make Honolulu a pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly city.

VERSION 2

Present: The director of the Department of Transportation Services is responsible for transportation systems, public transit, traffic control facilities and devices, traffic safety programs, and other duties.

If proposal passes:

- The powers, duties, and functions of the Department of Transportation Services would also include bikeways systems.
- The charter would state that it shall be one of the priorities of the Department of Transportation Services to make Honolulu a pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly city.

HOUSEKEEPING

This ballot question combines seven “housekeeping” items. One item is to also provide public notice by electronic medium and the remaining items are housekeeping amendments to conform to current functions and operations, to conform to legal requirements, to correct an inadvertent omission and for clarity. If the proposal passes:

- (a) Language regarding the Department of Information Technology would be modernized to use terms such as “information technology” and “telecommunications” instead of “data processing.”
- (b) To correct an inadvertent omission, the director of the Department of Customer Services will be included in the list of department heads to be appointed by the Mayor with the advice and consent of the Council and may be removed by the Mayor.
- (c) For clarification~~To conform to legal requirements~~, the charter would include a reference to the Hawaii State Constitution prohibition on Ethics Commission members from taking an active part in political campaigns.
- (d) To conform to a court decision, the unconstitutional prohibition on political campaign by Police Department employees would be deleted from the charter.
- (e) To conform to legal requirements~~correct an inadvertent addition~~, the Civil Defense administrator would be deleted from the list of department heads who are appointed by the Mayor with the advice and consent of the council and may be removed by the Mayor.
- (f) To conform to federal law, the requirement of Social Security numbers on petitions for recall, ordinances by initiative, and charter amendments would be deleted.
- (g) ~~Public notices would be required to be distributed via electronic medium (such as the Internet), in~~ In addition to the ~~current~~ requirement that public notice be published of publication in a newspaper of general circulation, public notices would be required to be distributed via electronic medium (such as the Internet).

DRAFT INTRODUCTORY TEXT

To be printed in the brochure; similar language could be included at the top of the newspaper advertisement.

VERSION 1

The City Charter is the governing document ~~“constitution”~~ of the City & County of Honolulu. ~~The Charter that~~ determines the basic structure of the city's departments and agencies, legislative and budget processes, elections, and many other foundations of city government.

The Charter requires that the Mayor and City Council appoint a Commission every ten years to review the Charter and submit changes to the voters.

The 2005-2006 Charter Commission has held more than 25 public meetings and received extensive testimony. After studying many proposals, eleven proposed charter amendments were selected to present to the voters at the General Election on November 7, 2006.

This booklet provides brief explanations of each proposal – the ballot question, the present situation, and what the proposed amendment would accomplish.

For more information, please contact the Charter Commission at 592-8622 or charter@honolulu.gov. Visit the Charter Commission's website at <http://www.honolulu.gov/chc>.

Please take a moment to read this booklet and decide how you will vote on each proposal. Honolulu's future depends on it!

2005-2006 Charter Commission
(list of Commissioners and staff)

VERSION 2 (with headers)

Honolulu's City Charter

The City Charter is Honolulu's governing document ~~“constitution, that establishes the principles” laying out the rules~~ by which our City government operates. The charter requires that the Mayor and City Council appoint a Commission every ten years to review the Charter and submit changes to the voters.

The 2005-2006 Charter Commission held more than 25 public meetings and received extensive testimony on changes to the Charter. After studying many proposals, eleven proposed charter amendments were selected to present to the voters at the General Election.

Vote on the Charter Amendments

We urge you to participate in determining help shape the future of our City by voting on these proposed charter amendments at the General Election on November 7, 2006.

This booklet provides brief explanations of each proposed charter amendment. To prepare for Election Day, please take a moment to read this booklet and decide how you will vote on each proposal.

For More Information

Contact the Charter Commission at 592-8622 or charter@honolulu.gov or visit the Charter Commission website at <http://www.honolulu.gov/chc>.

Mahalo for helping to shape the future of Honolulu!

2005-2006 Charter Commission
(list of Commissioners and staff)

VERSION 3 (letter style)

Dear Honolulu Voter,

We urge you to ~~participate in determining help shape~~ the future of our City by voting on proposed amendments to the City Charter at the General Election on November 7, 2006.

The City Charter is Honolulu's ~~governing document that establishes the principles "constitution," laying out the rules~~ by which our City government operates. The charter requires that the Mayor and City Council appoint a Commission every ten years to review the Charter and submit changes to the voters.

The 2005-2006 Charter Commission held more than 25 public meetings and received extensive testimony on changes to the Charter. After studying many proposals, eleven were selected to present to the voters at the General Election.

This booklet provides brief explanations of each proposed charter amendment. To prepare for Election Day, please take a moment to read this booklet and decide how you will vote on each proposal.

For more information, please contact the Charter Commission at 592-8622 or charter@honolulu.gov, or visit our website at <http://www.honolulu.gov/chc>.

Mahalo for helping to shape the future of Honolulu!

2005-2006 Charter Commission
(list of Commissioners and staff)